

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on July 19, 2007. Applicants hereby present arguments regarding newly added claims 38-40.

Newly added dependent Claim 38 depends on Claim 1 and recites, “wherein the at least one network appliance is configured to detect and remove exploits from messages.” This claim should be allowable because of its dependence on allowable Claim 1, for which the allowability was argued in the Amendment and Response dated April 30, 2007. Claim 38 should also be allowable because neither Seshadri et al., U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0002958, Lewis et al., U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0116119, nor any permissible combination of Seshadri and Lewis, discloses or suggests “wherein the at least one network appliance is configured to detect and remove exploits from messages,” as recited in Claim 1.

Newly added independent Claim 39 includes the limitations of amended claim 1, and also recites, “obtaining updates for at least one network appliance; recording a plurality of the updates in an update log; receiving an update request from the at least one network appliance; providing the updates recorded in the update log to the at least one network appliance in response to the receiving the update request”. Claim 39 should be allowable because neither Seshadri, Lewis, nor any permissible combination of them, discloses or suggests “obtaining updates for at least one network appliance; recording a plurality of the updates in an update log; receiving an update request from the at least one network appliance; providing the updates recorded in the update log to the at least one network appliance in response to the receiving the update request; determining an urgent update from among the updates; creating an urgent update notification (UUN) associated with the urgent update; sending the UUN to the at least one network appliance; receiving a request for the urgent update from the at least one network appliance, the request for the urgent update being sent by the at least one network appliance in response to receiving the UUN; and providing the urgent update to the at least one of the network appliances in response to receiving the request for the urgent update,” as recited in Claim 39.

Newly added independent Claim 40 includes the limitations of amended claim 13, and also recites, “periodically sending update requests to a server; obtaining updates from the server, the updates being stored in an update log of the server and being provided by the server in

response to the server receiving the update requests”. Claim 40 should be allowable because neither Seshadri, Lewis, nor any permissible combination of them, discloses or suggests “periodically sending update requests to a server; obtaining updates from the server, the updates being stored in an update log of the server and being provided by the server in response to the server receiving the update requests; receiving a message; determining that the message includes an urgent update notification (UUN); and in response to the determining that the message includes the UUN, establishing a connection with a server; pulling the urgent update from the server; and installing the urgent update,” as recited in Claim 40.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (208-286-1013) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521

Respectfully submitted,

Brake Hughes Bellermann LLP
Customer Number: 53666
208-286-1013

Date: August 7, 2007



Shane A. Kennedy
Reg No: 54,760